

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WAYMO LLC,

No. C 17-00939 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;  
OTTOMOTTO LLC; and OTTO  
TRUCKING LLC,

**ORDER RE NON-PARTY  
LYFT'S "OBJECTION AND  
REQUEST FOR A STAY OF  
MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S JULY  
7, 2017 DISCOVERY ORDER"**

Defendants.

On July 7, Judge Jacqueline Corley issued an order that, among other things, granted in part defendants' motion to compel plaintiff Waymo LLC to produce documents relating to its collaboration agreement with non-party Lyft, Inc. (Dkt. No. 832). Lyft has filed a nine-page-long "Objection and Request for a Stay of Magistrate Judge's July 7, 2017 Discovery Order" with no proposed order appended, purportedly pursuant to Section 636(b)(1)(A) of Title 28 of the United States Code, FRCP 72(a), and Civil Local Rule 72-2 (*see* Dkt. No. 866 at 4).

Civil Local Rule 72-2 provides in part (emphasis added):

Any objection filed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) must be made as a "*Motion for Relief from Nondispositive Pretrial Order of Magistrate Judge.*" The motion must specifically identify the portion of the Magistrate Judge's order to which objection is made and the reasons and authority therefor. *The motion may not exceed 5 pages* (not counting declarations and exhibits), and must set forth specifically the portions of the Magistrate Judge's findings, recommendation or report to which an objection is made, the action requested and the reasons supporting the motion *and must be accompanied by a proposed order.*

